

EXHIBIT TWO

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#14/ Affidavit  
Lourian  
6-12-03

Applicant: STOLL, Thomas G  
Serial No.: 09/489,982 Art Unit: 3626  
Filed: January 21, 2000 Examiner: C. Bleck  
For: DIGITAL PRESCRIPTION CARRIER AND MONITOR SYSTEM

STATE OF KANSAS )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS )


AFFIDAVIT OF INVENTOR

Comes now the Applicant, Karl P. Schmidt, and states as follows:


1. No later than December, 1997 I contributed to the invention of the subject matter that is claimed in the above-reference United States Patent Application.
2. I have carefully read the Affidavit of Thomas G. Stoll, executed on June 3, 2003. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the statements made therein are true.
3. No later than December of 1997, I contributed to the reduction to practice of the following method steps to the invention set forth in the application: providing an infrared data communication interface.
4. Additionally, I assisted Mr. Stoll in considering the feasibility of alternative designs of circuit board technology; however, these contributions remain unclaimed in the application.
5. All of the inventive activity performed by me took place within the United States.


Affidavit of Karl P. Schmidt  
Page 2

Under the penalty of perjury, I hereby affirm that each of the above and foregoing statements is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

  
Karl P. Schmidt, applicant

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2003.



  
Notary Public

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/489,982	STOLL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carolyn M Bleck	3626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Carolyn M Bleck.

(3) Dave Herron.

(2) Joseph Thomas.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 29 May 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: showed digital prescription camera

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 7, 14

Identification of prior art discussed: Combnich (4,835,372), Leigh-Spencer (5,602,802), Goetz (6,397,196)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed Adding limitations of Encryption feature to independent claims 1, 7, and 14 to better define over prior art of record.

Discussed addressing concerns raised in the last Office action with respect to the Affidavit.

We will reconsider the rejections in light of Any newly Submitted Amendments and/or arguments.

Joseph Thomas  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Carol Bleck  
Examiner's signature, if required